

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Currently, claims 1-2 and 4-13 are pending in this application.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112:**

In the “final” Office Action, claims 1-2 and 4-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Page 2, last line of the subsequent Advisory Action states “Examiner is now withdrawing the 112, second paragraph rejection.”

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 1-2 and 4-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Takeda. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Takeda was cited as document “D5” in the International Preliminary Examination Report (IPER) in the international stage (corresponding international application no. PCT/GB99/02492) of the present application. The IPER states, *inter alia*, “Claim 1 thus meets the requirements of Articles 33(1)-(4) PCT with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability.” The IPER further states “Claim 8 thus meets the requirements of Articles 33(1)-(4) PCT with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability.”

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, Takeda fails to teach or suggest either notify the enhanced service processing apparatus of an attempt to establish or terminate a call connection under a condition when an occurrence of a predetermined event has been previously recorded by the event detection means, or establish or

terminate a call connection without notifying the enhanced service apparatus under a condition when an occurrence of the predetermined event has not been previously recorded by the event detection means, as required by independent claim 1. Similar (but not necessarily identical) apply to the other claims.

Page 2 of the Advisory Action states “Examiner noted that the ‘previously recording’ feature is not recited anywhere in the claim.” However, independent claim 1 now explicitly requires “selectively either: (i) notify the enhanced service processing apparatus of that attempt under a condition when an occurrence of the predetermined event **has been previously recorded** by the event detection means,...or (ii) establish or terminate said call connection without notifying the enhanced service apparatus under a condition when an occurrence of the predetermined event **has not been previously recorded** by the event detection means.” As another example, independent claim 8 requires “(i) if a condition is determined that a **previous record** of the occurrence of one or more of said predetermined events exists at the switching center, then notifying an enhanced service processing apparatus of the attempt...; or (ii) if a condition is determined that no **previous record** of the occurrence of one or more of the predetermined events currently exists at the switching center, then establishing or terminating the call using only the switching functions of the switching center.” Similar comments apply to independent claims 12-13.

Exemplary embodiments of the present invention therefore provide the advantage that the enhanced serving processing apparatus is notified only under a certain condition (i.e., only when it is needed), namely under a condition of when an occurrence of a predetermined event has been previously recorded. (See (i) in claims 1 and 8 noted

above). If an occurrence of the predetermined event has not been previously recorded, a call connection is established or terminated without notifying the enhanced service apparatus.

• Exemplary embodiments of the present invention therefore relate to establishing  
• or terminating a call connection based on whether or not an occurrence of a predetermined event has been previously recorded. In contrast, calls received in the Takeda system are processed based on details associated with the call itself.

Since the enhanced service processing apparatus is only notified when an occurrence of predetermined event has been previously recorded (only when it is needed), communication traffic between network elements can be reduced.

Col. 6, lines 11-23 of Takeda states the following:

“FIG. 6 shows the processing flow executed by the processor 10 of the switching system 3.

When a call is detected, the BCSM creation request message is sent to the basic call processing part 13 (step 61), and the basic call processing part 13 creates a new BCSM (basic call state model) in such a manner as to correspond to the call (or the dial number) designated by the BCSM creation request (step 62). Thereafter, the basic call processing is executed in accordance with this BCSM (step 63).

Each BCSM is made up of a plurality of states (or steps) and some of them are defined as a DP (detection point) which can be armed the trigger.”

As can be seen from the above portion of Takeda and the top of Fig. 6, Takeda describes a process in which all calls are treated in the same manner by creating a BCSM (basic call state model) corresponding to the call. Accordingly, all calls received in Takeda's system are processed based on the details with the call itself (such as billing for toll-free members) as opposed to whether or not the occurrence of a predetermined event

***PETTIFOR et al.***  
***Application No. 09/743,702***  
***December 5, 2005***

associated with a subscriber line has been previously recorded (see (i) and (ii) in independent claims 1, 8 and 12-13).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-2 and 4-13 are not "obvious" over Takeda and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.


**Conclusion:**

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Raymond Y. Mah  
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:sl  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4044  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100